

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

76



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,893	01/12/2002	Koteshwerrao Adusumilli	42390P12318X	3131

7590 07/15/2004

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,893

Applicant(s)

ADUSUMILLI, KOTESHWERRAO

Examiner

Christopher J Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11202,72803,61504.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 01/12/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Those applications able to be found online have been considered, but references that could not be found are marked with a line through them and have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22, 23, and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coile US 6,473,406 in view of Davis US 6,367,009.

As per claim 1, Coile discloses sending a message from a client to a server to establish a connection, (Col 3 lines 24-30). Coile discloses intercepting the data at a security system (proxy) associated with the server to perform authentication functions, (Col 5 lines 57-60).

Coile does not disclose that a message is sent to establish a "secure" connection.

Art Unit: 2134

Davis discloses sending a message (certificate message) to establish a secure SSL connection, (Col 11 lines 30-35).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add Davis's certificate message and SSL protocol to Coile's proxy server. The proxy server of Coile using the certificate/SSL system of Davis would improve the security of the communications of the system.

As per claim 2, Coile does not disclose determining server authentication.

Davis discloses determining server authentication, (Col 10 line 35).

As per claim 3, Coile discloses client authentication, (Col 5 lines 63-65).

As per claim 4, Coile does not disclose digital certificates.

Davis discloses validating digital certificates, (Col 10 lines 35-40).

As per claim 5, Coile does not disclose encryption.

Davis discloses SSL encryption and decryption, (Col 2 lines 10-15).

As per claim 6, Coile does not disclose specific authentication techniques.

Davis discloses a server requesting client authentication, and authenticating the client's certificate, (Col 11 lines 39-43).

As per claim 7, Coile does not disclose digital signatures.

Davis discloses the client including a digital signature which is authenticated, (Col 11, line 41).

As per claims 8-11, 19, 22 26-32 Coile does not disclose SSL.

Davis discloses the SSL connection algorithm. Davis discloses a client sending a "client hello" message indicating a request to establish a secure connection with the server, (Col 10 line 20, Fig 6). Davis discloses the Server sending a "server

Art Unit: 2134

hello" message, (Col 10 line 21, Fig 6). Davis discloses exchanging authentication information, (Col 10 lines 30-35). Davis discloses sending a "server hello done" (Col 10 line 33, Fig 6). Davis discloses that in the SSL protocol authentication information is exchanged between the client and server, (Col 10 lines 24,25, 41-44). Davis discloses the transaction completes in the SSL protocol, which includes a "client hello done" message, (Col 10 lines 43-47).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add the SSL protocol of Davis to the authentication proxy server of Coile to improve security and prevent unauthorized access.

As per claim 12, Coile does not disclose CRL checking.

Davis discloses the determining if the client is on a CRL (list), (Col 13, lines 35-42).

As per claim 13, Coile does not disclose digital signatures.

Davis discloses the client providing a digital signature for verification, (Col 11 lines 40-44).

As per claim 14, Coile does not disclose decryption.

Davis discloses decryption using the SSL protocol, (Col 2 lines 10-14).

As per claim 15, Coile discloses an application module (proxy server) to receive incoming data from a client destined for a given server and route the data to an authentication module (authentication program) to validate the identity of the client, (Col 3 lines 24-30, Col 5 lines 59, 60, 63, 64). Coile discloses the system is wired, (Fig 1). Coile does not disclose a wireless system, or encryption.

Art Unit: 2134

Davis discloses wireless clients (Fig 2). Davis discloses encryption and decryption through the SSL protocol, (Col 2 lines 10-14).

As per claims 16, 18, 20, 23, and 25, the examiner takes official notice, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to obtain the server certificate from a certificate authority at user defined intervals.

Claims 17, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher US 6,125,349.

The Coile-Davis combination does not disclose short and long term certificates.

Maher discloses use of short and long-term certificates, (Col 5 lines 5-20).

It would be obvious to add the use of short and long-term certificates of Maher with Coile-Davis's authentication system, so that the short-term certificates could be utilized after initial authentication, so that the server would not have to check the CRL until after the short-term certificate had expired.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Oorschot US 5,699,431

As per claim 21, the Coile-Davis combination does not disclose updating the CRL.

Van Oorshot discloses updating the CRL, (Col 4 lines 39-42).

It would be obvious to add CRL updating to the Coile-Davis combination to prevent unauthorized certificate holders from accessing a protected resource.

Art Unit: 2134


Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-8023. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100